



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/654,205	09/01/2000	Ephraim Feig	YO999-487	6298

7590 03/07/2005

Harry F Smith Esq
Ohlandt Greeley Ruggiero & Perle LLP
One Landmark Square
9th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

CHUONG, TRUC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/654,205

Applicant(s)

FEIG ET AL.

Examiner

Truc T Chuong

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 September 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to communication, filed 07/09/04.
2. Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. This action is made final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1, 3, 4-6, 8-12, 14, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,771) in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,840).

As to claims 1, 11, and 12, Rangan shows a method for indicating the location or time dependent video hypervideo hyperlinks to a user, comprising the steps of:

displaying a video presentation on at least a portion of a display device screen, said video presentation including a hypervideo hyperlink; and

providing the user, at times of viewing, with at least one user selectable display attribute for said hypervideo hyperlink (e.g., col. 8 lines 59-67, col. 9 lines 1-11 and figs. 2, 4) but Rangan does not clearly shows said hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region.

Chen clearly teaches the hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region (a hot link region, e.g., col. 2 lines 38-60 and figs. 1-2). It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, a person with ordinary skill in the art would add this hot link region into Rangan's hypervideo hyperlinks for a user to be able to alter and manipulate a visual attribute of a portion of the hot link region (col. 2 lines 46-49).

As to claim 3, Rangan teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of displaying to the user, at the time of viewing, an options menu listing said at least one user selectable display attributes, wherein said displaying of said options menu is selectively controlled by the user (e.g., col. 15 lines 41-60 and figs. 2, 4).

As to claims 4 and 14, Rangan teaches the method wherein the user selectively controls the displaying of said options menu by positioning a user-controlled cursor in a specified emphasis region of said display device screen (e.g., col. 26 lines 7-28 and figs. 2, 4).

As to claim 5, Rangan teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the steps of:

opening a hypervideo data file (e.g., col. 8 lines 66-67 and col. 9 lines 1-7);

decoding a video file associated with said hypervideo data file; and

encoding (encode, e.g., col. 20 lines 56-64) the decoded video file with a

hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region in at least one key frame (see claim 1 above for hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region).

As to claim 6, this is a system claim of method claims 1 and 5. Note the rejections of claims 1 and 5 above.

As to claims 8-10; these are system claims of method claims 3-5. Note the rejections of claims 3-5 above respectively.

As to claims 15 and 17, they are computer program product claims of method claims 1 and 2. Note the rejections of claims 1 and 2 above respectively.

Art Unit: 2179

5. Claims 2, 7, 13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,771) in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,840) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Trueblood et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,808,984).

As to claims 2 and 13, Rangan in view of Chen teaches the method wherein at least one of said user selectable display attribute comprises a least one of surrounding said hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region with a visible border, brightening the hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region in relation to other portions of said hypervideo (see claim 1 above), but they do not teach displaying said hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region in gray scale only format, and displaying said hypervideo-hyperlink emphasis region in reverse-color mode format. Trueblood clearly teaches gray scale format and reverse-color mode format (e.g., col. 6 lines 16-22 and col. 7 lines 53-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add these features taught by Trueblood into Rangan's system for accurate color mixing (col. 6 lines 16-17).

As to claim 7, this is a system claim of method claim 2. Note the rejection of claim 2 above.

As to claim 16, this is a computer program product claim of method claim 2 above. Note the rejection of claim 2 above.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed in the communication have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants have argued and Examiner does not agree with the following reasons:

a. Rangan does not teach a user selectable attribute for the hypervideo hyperlink.

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given >their< broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." > In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

In this case, Rangan shows the teaching of scripts in a web designer to handle the events; therefore, the web designer inherently uses other editing features of the web against thumbnails/images when playing/editing the hypervideo hyperlinks (e.g., col. 26 lines 40-46). The user can change the ways of the hypervideo hyperlink displayed as he or she desires (e.g., col. 15 lines 1-7), the user can also set his or her hypervideo viewer to accentuate, or to suppress, hyperlinks in a manner that is remotely analogous to the way that cookies may be accepted or declined by a browser program during Internet browsing, or a coloration, or some other visually perceptible "clue" will overlay or alter a scene object whereat exists a hyperlink (e.g., col. 15 lines 13-32), or the user can set the displayed time, delay or postpone of the event (e.g., col. 16 lines 15-17 and col. 16 lines 53-55); therefore, Rangan clearly teaches that the hypervideo hyperlink can be set by selecting of different attributes to change the display/event, and Rangan's invention

Art Unit: 2179

clearly reads on the claim language of the applicant has been claimed and defined in the specification.

b. Rangan does not teach an options menu listing the selectable display attributes.

Rangan teaches the web designer may select the particular "VCR" control and playback "buttons", choose the size (size is considered as an attribute on a menu list with others selectable attributes) of video window playback, and/or associate particular channels with the video playback (e.g., col. 22 lines 45-49); therefore, Rangan clearly teaches the options menu for the user to select and change the display.

All other arguments are depended on the main points, which have already been clearly addressed above.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2179

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 571-272-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Truc T. Chuong

02/01/05


BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER